



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RESULTS OF PROHIBITORY LEGISLATION.

---

THERE exists to-day in the English-speaking world a very large body of men and women, of every rank and station in life, who believe that intemperance, and all that comes from it, are not a necessary condition of society; that it is possible to put these evils away. They believe there is intelligence, virtue, and piety enough in the world to accomplish this, if, by a full presentation of the facts in the case, they be brought to coöperate heartily in the work.

The friends of temperance come before the public with their proposition to that end. It is to forbid by law, and to suppress by a strong hand, the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, without which any considerable diminution of the evils of intemperance will be impossible. The liquor traffic is a very great and profitable trade. There are large numbers of people involved in it, by interest, appetite, or passion, who cannot be moved, or even touched, by the considerations which inspire benevolent, philanthropic, patriotic men and women. The movers in this work may properly be called upon to justify their proposition to the people. Without doing this satisfactorily, they cannot expect such general approval and coöperation as is necessary for the accomplishment of the work.

The liquor traffic is absolutely inconsistent with the general good, and cannot in any way be made to harmonize with it. It is in deadly hostility to every interest of nation, state, and society. It wastes the wealth of the country, undermines the virtue of the people, and is the source of a very large part of the poverty, degradation, insanity, and crime that curse the nation. It sends misery into hundreds of thousands of homes, which but for it would be prosperous, peaceful, and happy. The strength of a nation is in proportion to the intelligence, virtue, industry, and thrift of the people. The influence of the liquor traffic is to

make its victims ignorant and brutal, to undermine their habits of industry, and to impoverish them. As the liquor traffic flourishes, every legitimate industry languishes and dies. The industry of the nation and its industrial products are largely diminished by the malign influence of this trade.

Mr. Benjamin Whitworth, M. P., is one of the largest employers of labor in England. At a great public meeting in Exeter Hall, I heard him say that in one of his establishments—iron-works—five thousand men are employed. On Mondays the works are not in operation, the men not having recovered from the debauch of Saturday night and Sunday. As a consequence of this, five thousand men lose each fifty-two days' wages in the year—in all, two hundred and sixty thousand days' wages. The nation loses two hundred and sixty thousand days' work, and the owners of the establishment lose thirty thousand pounds in the year. He said that every industrial establishment in the country, large and small, had a similar experience, and, as the result of it, the industrial products of the country were one-third less than they would be without the liquor traffic. The men spent most of their wages in the drink-shops, they and their families living in abject misery, so that they become paupers when dull trade throws them out of employment even for a week.

The great jails and other prisons of the country, and the work-houses, are crowded with working-men and working-women, a large part of whom, but for the liquor traffic, would be law-abiding, peaceful, and self-supporting. Judge Hill, of Birmingham, at an assize where there was a very large criminal calendar, said to the grand jury: "But for the public-house, gentlemen of the jury, you and I would have very little to do. Whichever way we turn, whatever measures we propose for the amelioration of the condition of the people, intemperance starts up and blocks the way." I heard Lord Shaftesbury say, at a great public meeting in Free Trade Hall, Manchester: "Nineteen twentieths of the misery and degradation of the people come from over-crowding." But the proofs are abundant that over-crowding comes from intemperance. It is estimated that the working classes of England spend every year more than \$500,000,000 in drink; the whole expenditure in that way in the country being \$700,000,000. The vast sum thus wasted would go far toward furnishing better houses for the people, and sufficient, if not abundant, food and comfortable raiment for all.

The New York "Independent," of the 8th September last, said:

"It is affirmed by the collectors of statistics in regard to intemperance, that in the year 1879 there was paid out for intoxicating drinks by the people of Germany the sum of \$650,000,000, and by those of France, \$580,000,000; of Great Britain, \$750,000,000, and of the United States \$720,000,000, making \$2,700,000,000. This is about the amount of the debt of the United States at the close of the war of the rebellion; and even this huge sum does not by any means represent the whole cost incident to the use of intoxicating drinks. To this must be added the loss of time thus occasioned, the expense of ill health and actual disease consequent upon rum-drinking, the cost of punishing the crimes committed by drunkards [and supporting the poor, the paupers, and the insane], and numerous other items, making in the aggregate an actual cost to society fully equal to the amount directly spent for intoxicating liquors. And also the fact that there are no profits that can compensate [even in part] for this enormous cost. Can there be any doubt, as a matter of sound political economy, to say nothing about good morals, that society should arm itself to the teeth for the suppression of a most expensive vice? The most stringent prohibition would be the highest wisdom. Why tamper with such an evil? Why not cut it up, root and branch?"

The people of Maine, in 1857, resolved that, for their State, it should be destroyed. They determined to try to put away the evils of intemperance by forbidding and suppressing its cause, to wit: the liquor traffic. The people of Maine consumed their full share of intoxicating liquors, and more, according to their numbers. They spent in strong drink the entire valuation of all their property of every kind in every term of less than twenty years. Maine was the poorest State in the Union. Its great industry was the lumber trade—converting its vast forests of pine into lumber, transporting it to the West Indies, and receiving in return for it West India rum, and molasses to be converted by its many distilleries into New England rum, all of which went down the throats of the people. Literally, our boundless forests of invaluable pine went down the throats of our people in the form of rum. The wages of the people were spent in that way, except a small part devoted to a miserable support of their families. Evidences of poverty were everywhere seen in dilapidated houses, barns, farms, school-houses, town-houses, and meeting-houses. Old hats and rags were in the windows to stop the broken panes; the roofs were leaking; doors were hanging by one hinge, and often there was no hinge at all. The miserable cattle, shaggy and hide-bound with neglect and famine, were

shivering under the lee of shabby barns, while their equally miserable owners were spending their days and nights around the stove of the country grocery, the larger part of whose sales was of rum consumed by these people. Maine was never a dollar the richer, but rather the poorer, for all this vast industry. The masses of her people were in the forest in winter, felling trees and drawing them to the water-courses, living in camps, with the inevitable rum as a large part of their rations. At the breaking up of the streams in the spring, the men "drove" the logs down to the mills. In these mills the mighty trees were converted into lumber, and in hundreds of ships this was transported to the West Indies. In camp, on "the drive," at the mills, and in the ships, rum was always in plenty—impoverishing, degrading, brutifying all who drank it.

The people of the State resolved in 1857 to change all this. They said by the law emphatically: "The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors is forbidden," and pains and penalties of fine and imprisonment were provided. They said further: "This act shall take effect upon its approval by the Governor." On that day there were great stocks of liquors in the hands of dealers, wholesale and retail, all over the State, and by the express terms of the law, all these liquors were liable to be seized wherever found, to be confiscated and destroyed, as a deadly enemy to the public weal. This extraordinary law of prohibition and suppression of a great trade passed through all its stages in both houses of the legislature in one day, by a vote of eighty-six to forty in the House, and eighteen to ten in the Senate. This was Saturday, the 31st of May, and on the morning of Monday, the 2d of June, the Governor approved the bill, and it became law, and it is so to this day.

The wires flashed throughout the country, and all over the world, the startling intelligence that in Maine the liquor traffic had been put under the ban of the law; that it was no longer to be tolerated, being condemned to die as inconsistent with the general good. Bad men everywhere were angered; good men rejoiced. At a great religious meeting in Boston on that second day of June, Lyman Beecher read the telegram announcing to him the wonderful event, and said: "Brethren, let us thank the Lord devoutly; this law hits the devil a stunning blow right between the eyes." The London "Times" said of it: "If this law shall remain on the statute books of Maine, it will show better

than any other thing can do that the people are capable of self-government." It does stand and will stand, thoroughly approved as it is by an overwhelming public opinion.

Governor Dix, of New York, in a message to the Legislature of that State, said :

"I have never doubted the expediency and rightfulness of such legislation [to prohibit the liquor traffic]. Intemperance is the undoubted cause of more than four-fifths of the poverty, pauperism, and crime with which the State is afflicted. I approve [such legislation] both as a matter of principle and policy ; it lies in the direction of popular liberty—the right of the people to determine for themselves what is most conducive to their own interests."

Governor Long, of Massachusetts, in his message of January, 1881, says :

"There is a growing demand, shared by men of all shades of theoretical opinion, . . . that just as far and as fast as possible the dram-shop should be rooted out, in the interest alike of good morals and of the material welfare of capital and labor. The bureau of statistics has, during the year, added to its admirable work by conducting an original inquiry into the causes of crime. It has made personal investigation in every case in the nine criminal courts of Suffolk County, which were selected as a sample, and the result constitutes the strongest indictment against the use of intoxicating liquors that has been drawn. Of the sixteen thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven cases, more than seventy-two per cent. were for the various grades of drunkenness : and in addition to these, more than twelve per cent. were offenses committed by persons under the influence of liquor, leaving only some fifteen per cent. of crime to represent what would be the total amount but for the use of intoxicating liquors. These statistics are important, as presenting this subject in the economical light of its relation to the industrial interests of the commonwealth, and of an appeal to those who depend upon them, whether as employed or employers. They cannot fail to impress, not only the moralist, but, in view of the enormous waste they suggest, the economist, the manufacturer, and the working-man also."

The right of the State to prohibit the liquor traffic is not denied, because that question has been finally settled by all our highest courts of appeal, with no dissenting voice, wherever it has been raised.

The chief objection to the adoption of prohibition in other States, where it is strenuously urged, is, that in Maine no good results have come from it, or at least that these results have not met the expectations of the friends of the prohibitory policy. Let us see what the actual results of it have been and are. The open sale of liquors, immediately upon the enactment of the

law, ceased throughout the State. The dealers sent their stocks of contraband goods away, and the traffic, so far as it continued at all, was carried on upon a very small scale clandestinely by the lowest part of our people. There is now no distillery or brewery in the State. West India rum was formerly imported by the cargo; now, the liquor brought here is smuggled in small packages, concealed in flour-barrels or sugar-barrels, or in boxes marked "eggs" or "glass," or otherwise disguised, so as to deceive the officers, whose duty it is to seize liquors upon sight, wherever found, without a warrant, if they are suspected of being intended for sale.

The proportion for Maine of the national drink bill, according to its population, would be about thirteen millions of dollars annually, but we are confident that half a million will cover the cost of all the liquors smuggled into the State and sold in violation of law, but we set it down in our estimate at one million. This enormous diminution in the amount of the liquor trade in Maine, since the enactment of the law, is obvious to all who know what the trade was before; and the consequent improvement in the business of the State and in the condition of the people is very great. Many testimonies were obtained in 1872 from the highest authorities as to the actual working of the law, after more than twenty years' experience of it. These were intended to neutralize the many falsehoods that have been industriously circulated by interested parties as to its failure to accomplish any of the good that was expected from it.

Among these is one from the Governor of Maine and every member of the Executive Council, who say:

"At the time of the enactment of the Maine Law, the liquor traffic was carried on in Maine extensively and openly, as it now is in States where the trade is licensed. The effect of the law in diminishing the trade in intoxicating drinks was immediate and very great. In many parts of Maine the liquor trade has absolutely ceased to exist—liquor-shops are unknown, and wherever within the State the trade exists at all, it is carried on secretly and with caution, as other unlawful things are done. One effect of the law has been to render the liquor trade disreputable, and no person who knew Maine as it was before the law, and has been acquainted with it down to the present time, can doubt that the effect of the law has been most marked and salutary. Poverty, pauperism, and crime have been greatly diminished by it, because vastly less money has been wasted in strong drink. In some places, and at some times, the execution of the law has been fitful and capricious, yet, with these exceptions, the law has been as well enforced as our other criminal laws generally are."

Hannibal Hamlin, present United States Minister to Spain, Lot M. Morrill, late United States Senator, late Secretary of the Treasury, present Collector of the Port of Portland, and Wm. P. Frye, now United States Senator, said:

"At the time of the enactment of the law, in 1851, the traffic existed openly and everywhere in Maine, as it now does in those States where it is not prohibited. The immediate effect was to outlaw the trade, declaring it to be inconsistent with the general welfare, and reducing it to very small proportions.

"In many parts of the State it is now nearly or quite unknown. There are large districts of country where liquor-shops are absolutely unknown; and everywhere within our borders, where the trade exists at all, it is carried on secretly and in a small way.

"The favorable effects of this change are great, and everywhere apparent to the most casual observer who has any knowledge of the State prior to the year 1851. We do not believe the people of Maine, for any consideration, would again sanction the policy of license to 'drinking-houses and tippling-shops.'"

Mr. Blaine adds to this:

"I did not reside in the State prior to the enactment of the first prohibitory law, and therefore cannot make a comparative statement from my own knowledge; but so far as my knowledge extends, derived from twenty years' observation of the cause of temperance in this State, I most cordially concur in all that is said in the foregoing letter."

John A. Peters, then member of Congress, now Justice of the Supreme Court of Maine, and Eugene Hale, now United States Senator, said: "We are satisfied that there is much less intemperance in Maine than formerly, and that the result is largely produced by what is termed prohibitory legislation."

Benj. Kingsbury, Mayor of Portland, W. W. Thomas, Aug. E. Stevens, J. T. McCobb, Jacob McLellan, ex-Mayors, said: "As the result of the policy of prohibition, we have to say that the liquor traffic has fallen off very largely. The diminution of the trade is very great, and the favorable effects of the policy of prohibition are manifest to the most casual observer."

Wm. L. Putnam, ex-Mayor of Portland, said: "I have had good opportunity to observe the condition of this State in matter of the use and sale of intoxicating liquors for several years past, as compared with some other States where there are no prohibitory laws, and am certain that the rural portions of Maine are, and have been, in an infinitely better condition with reference to



the sale and use of such liquors, than similar portions of other States referred to. And this must fairly be considered the result of prohibitory legislation."

Walcott Hamlin, Supervisor of Internal Revenue, District of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, said: "In the course of my duty as internal revenue officer, I have become thoroughly acquainted with the state and extent of the liquor traffic in Maine, and I have no hesitation in saying that the beer trade is not more than one per cent. of what I remember it to have been, and the trade in distilled liquors is not more than ten per cent. of what it was formerly. . . . When liquor is sold at all, it is done secretly, through fear of the law."

General Chamberlain, President of Bowdoin College, ex-Governor of Maine, said: "The declaration made by many persons that the Maine Law is inoperative, and that liquors are sold freely and in large quantities in this State, is not true. The liquor traffic has been greatly repressed and diminished here (Brunswick) and throughout the State, and in many places has been entirely swept away. The law is as well executed generally in the State as other criminal laws are. . . . Where liquors are sold at all, it is in very small quantities compared with the old times, and in a secret way, as other unlawful things are done."

E. G. Harlow, of the Executive Council in Maine, said: "I am thoroughly acquainted with my own county (Oxford), and do not hesitate to say there is not now a gallon of liquor sold, where there was once a barrel, before the Maine Law of 1851. At our last term of Supreme Judicial Court, not a single indictment for any crime was found. Our county jail is empty, our work-houses greatly reduced (in number of inmates), and the improvement is wonderful."

Ex-Governor Dingley, in an article published in March last, says:

"Prohibition has effectually stopped the manufacture of distilled and fermented liquors in Maine. . . . To-day there is not a distillery or brewery in Maine. Prohibition has well-nigh stopped the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the rural districts of Maine. . . . All the country taverns had open bars, and all country stores sold liquors as freely as molasses or calico. The town of Durham, with less than fifteen hundred inhabitants, had, in 1832, seven licensed grog-shops. To-day there is not a drop of liquor sold in town. Readfield had seven open bars, at which were sold two thousand three hundred gallons of spirits annually. Now none is sold to be used as a

beverage. Minot (then including Auburn), with a population of two thousand nine hundred and three, in 1833, had thirteen grog-shops. Now, these towns, with a population of ten thousand, have not one place where liquor is known to be sold as a beverage."

The article of Governor Dingley contains a great many more statements of facts and figures to the same purpose, and concludes:

"Prohibitory Maine has about the same population as licensed New Jersey, yet the liquor tax in the former State is only three cents per inhabitant, while in the latter State it is two dollars and forty cents, and in the country at large one dollar and eighty-three cents. In reply to the assertion that tobacco and opium are taking the place of liquor-drinking in Maine, I may mention that the tobacco-tax paid by Maine is only seventeen cents per inhabitant, while the average for the country is one dollar per inhabitant; and opium-eating is far less prevalent here than in other Eastern States."

The address to the people of Maine by the State Temperance Society, in 1880, says:

"After a trial of nearly thirty years, interrupted by two years of license in 1856 and 1857, the judgment of a decided majority of the people of Maine is that prohibition is more effective in mitigating the evils of the dram-shop than any other legal policy ever devised.

"In more than three-fourths of the State, including most of the rural districts and many cities, prohibition is faithfully enforced by the ordinary officers of the law, with the most gratifying results. There is not a distillery or brewery in our limits. In the rural districts and a large portion of the villages, open dram-shops are unknown, and secret sales rare. In a majority of the cities, the open dram-shop is unknown. In the cities of Lewiston and Auburn, with twenty thousand people, for example, the success with which the liquor traffic has been restrained for many years affords the best evidence of the practicability and wisdom of our prohibitory laws."

The Legislative Committee on Temperance, 1881, say:

"The people of the State have had ample opportunity to observe the working of our prohibitory law, and to judge of its efficiency in restricting the sale of liquors, and in suppressing the vice of intemperance. A large majority of the citizens of Maine, we are confident, believe that it is a righteous law, and that it has proved an effective agency in shutting up liquor-shops and restricting the sale and use of intoxicating liquors.

"The principle of prohibition," says Governor Davis in his message,—and we fully indorse the statement,—"has been so long the settled policy of the State, and has been found so useful and effective in suppressing the liquor traffic, that no party or class of men now dare to assail it."

The results of prohibition in Maine have been so satisfactory to the people, that there is no organized or respectable opposition

or objection to it in any quarter. It is now accepted by the great body of the people as the settled policy of the State. The Republican party in Maine, from its foundation, has adopted prohibition as a chief plank in its platform, and it remains such to this day. The Democratic party, at its State conventions, has repeatedly and emphatically repudiated the policy of license to the liquor traffic, and is therefore virtually committed to prohibition.

In 1878, the Republican State Convention resolved: "It is a source of congratulation that the principle of prohibition, which has always been upheld by Republicans, is now concurred in by so large a majority of the people that it is no longer a party question, the Democrats having for several years declined to contest and dispute it. . . . Temperance among the people may be greatly promoted by wise prohibitory legislation."

In 1879, the Republican State Convention said: "We recognize temperance as a cause which has conferred the greatest benefits on the State, and we sustain the principle of prohibition, which, in its operation, has so largely suppressed liquor selling, and added incalculably to the sum of virtue and prosperity among the people. Every interest of the State and its people requires the thorough and impartial enforcement of all the laws."

In the Republican State Convention of 1880—the last convention—it was "*Resolved*, That experience has demonstrated the wisdom of the policy of prohibition as an auxiliary of temperance, and as contributing to the material wealth, happiness, and prosperity of the State; and we refer, with confidence and pride, to our undeviating support of the same as one of the cardinal principles of the Republican party in Maine."

If it be conceded that the people of Maine possess an ordinary share of intelligence, so as to be able to judge properly of their own interests, it would be impossible that the political parties should occupy such ground in relation to prohibition, unless the results of it were clearly good.

It was charged by a political paper in Maine, during the campaign of 1880, that the State had suffered greatly in its material interests during the last twenty years, under Republican rule. At a great political meeting, held a week or two afterward, at City Hall, Portland, Mr. Blaine alluded to this, and said: "There is no State in this Union that has prospered so much as Maine has during the last twenty years": and he went at length into the subject, so as to demonstrate to the vast audience that he had

properly stated the fact; there has been no reply to his assertion or his argument from any quarter.

The liquor traffic still lingers in some of the larger cities in Maine, where it is conducted upon a comparatively small scale, and with more or less secrecy, mostly by the same class of men who keep gambling houses and houses of ill-fame, the lowest part of our foreign population. The traffic here occupies the same place in public opinion that these other crimes do. This persistency of the traffic in the cities is due entirely to some defects in the law, as it now stands, which we know perfectly, and which will be corrected by and by, and then the last vestige of this great evil will be summarily swept away. We shall then be able to demonstrate to the world, more thoroughly than we now can, how great are the benefits to the State and people resulting from the absolute suppression of the liquor traffic, from which the nation suffers more, year by year, and every year, "than from war, pestilence, and famine, those greatest scourges of the human family."

NEAL DOW.